

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, 13-15, 17, 19-21, 23, 26-29, 31, 33-35, 37 and 40 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 13, 26, 27, 33 and 40 are independent. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, 13-15, 17, 19-21, 23, 26-29, 31, 33-35, 37 and 40 stand rejected. Applicants amend claims 1, 13, 26, 27, 33 and 40. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections

I. Teleconference

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting a teleconference on January 16, 2008. During that teleconference, Applicants discussed with the Examiner potential amendments that would place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner identified two areas that would offer a patentable distinction over the prior art: the addition of some form of user-interaction during the creation of the service- or role- abstractions, and a definition of what the packet rules examine. Applicants have amended the independent claims to include these features.

II. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1, 13, 26, 27, 33 and 40 have been amended to recite user-interaction in the definition of the service- and role- abstractions. For example, claim 1 recites ***in response to a user, creating one or more service abstractions, each service abstraction representing a named set of one or more of the packet rules.*** Claims 1, 13, 26, 27, 33 and 40 have also been amended to recite that they ***control usage of network resources on the communications network by the authenticated user.***

Further, claims 1, 13, 26, 27, 33 and 40 have been amended to recite ***wherein the one or more packet rules are defined to examine any portion of a packet.***

Applicants feel that these amendments address the Examiner's concerns, and submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

A. Claims 1-3, 5 and 26

Claims 1-3, 5 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0021283 (hereafter “See”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,871,232 (hereafter “Curie”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Neither See nor Curie discloses *in response to a user, creating one or more service abstractions, each service abstraction representing a named set of one or more of the packet rules*, nor does See or Curie disclose *control usage of network resources on the communications network by the authenticated user*, as recited by independent claims 1 and 26. Both references are silent as to such user-interaction.

Further, neither See nor Curie discloses *wherein the one or more packet rules are defined to examine any portion of a packet*, as recited by independent claims 1 and 26. Neither See nor Curie utilizes packet rules. Both references are entirely silent as to the use of packets.

Further, neither See nor Curie discloses *creating one or more service abstractions*, nor *creating one or more packet rules*. The policy groups of See, which the Examiner equates to service abstractions, and the policy rules of See, which the Examiner equates to packet rules, are not equivalent to service abstractions and packet rules, respectively, as those terms are used in the Applicants’ Specification. This difference can be seen by comparing Figure 4 of See, which depicts a repository of policy rules, to the description of packet rules and service abstractions in the Application at page 17, line 5 through page 18, line 5. Moreover, the “roles” defined in the cited passages of Curie (col. 21, lines 50-65) do not correspond to the service- or role-abstractions described in the Application.

Claims 2-3 and 5 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every element of claim 1. Therefore, neither See nor Curie disclose each and every element of claims 2-3 and 5. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-3, 5 and 26 be withdrawn.

B. Claims 7-9, 11, 27-29 and 31

Claims 7-9, 11, 27-29 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over See in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,905,715 (hereafter “Azarmi”) and further in view of Curie. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As discussed above, neither See nor Curie discloses *in response to a user, creating one or more service abstractions, each service abstraction representing a named set of one or more of the packet rules*, nor does See or Curie disclose *control usage of network resources on the communications network by the authenticated user*, as recited by independent claim 1. Further, neither See nor Curie discloses *wherein the one or more packet rules are defined to examine any portion of a packet*, as recited by independent claim 1. Further, neither See nor Curie discloses *creating one or more service abstractions*, nor *creating one or more packet rules*, as recited by independent claim 1.

The Examiner recognizes that Azarmi does not describe these features, and does not suggest that these features are present in Azarmi. Therefore, Curie, See, and Azarmi, alone or in combination, do not disclose each and every element of claim 1. Claims 7-9 and 11 depend from claim 1. Therefore, Curie, See, and Azarmi do not disclose each and every element of claims 7-9 and 11. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 7-9 and 11 be withdrawn.

Further, Azarmi does not describe *wherein the one or more packet rules are defined to examine any portion of a packet*, as present in claim 27. Azarmi is silent as to packets.

Moreover, Azarmi does not describe *in response to a user, defining one or more role abstractions associated with an authenticated user, each role abstraction representing a role of an authenticated user with respect to the communications network for controlling usage of network resources on the communications network by the authenticated user*, and *each role abstraction including a set of one or more packet rules*, as present in claim 27. Azarmi is silent about such user-interaction.

Further, the management rules which the Examiner equates to packet rules do not correspond to the packet rules described in the Application. The feature-describing data sets and service provisions that the Examiner equates to role abstractions do not correspond to the role abstractions described in the Application. Thus, Azarmi does not describe *defining one or more role abstractions associated with an authenticated user, each role abstraction representing a role of an authenticated user with respect to the communications network for controlling usage of network resources on the communications network by the authenticated user, and each role abstraction including a set of one or more packet rules*, as present in claim 27, nor does Azarmi describe *providing the one or more role abstractions* as present in claim 27.

Claims 28-29 and 31 depend from claim 27. Thus, claims 28-29 and 31 include each and every element of claim 27. See, Curie, and Azarmi do not disclose each and every element of claims 28-29 and 31. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claims 27-29 and 31 be withdrawn.

C. Claims 13-15 and 17

Claims 13-15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over See in view of “Nessett” (no citation information has been provided for “Nessett”) and further in view of Curie. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As noted above, no citation information has been provided for “Nessett.” Nevertheless, the Examiner does not assert that Nessett discloses any of the elements of independent claim 13 except for a rule editing module. As described above, neither See nor Curie disclose *one or more packet rules for analyzing packets received at one or more devices of the communications network, each rule including a condition and action to be taken if a packet received at a device satisfies the condition, wherein the one or more packet rules are defined to examine any portion of a packet*, nor do See or Curie disclose *a service editing module to create, in response to a user, one or more service abstractions associated with an authenticated user of the communications network for controlling usage of network resources on the communications network by the authenticated user, each service abstraction*

representing a named set of one or more of the packet rules, nor do See or Curie disclose *one or more created service abstractions or one or more created packet rules*.

See, Curie and Nessett do not disclose each and every element of independent claim 13. Claims 14-15 and 17 depend from claim 13 and, as such, include each and every element of claim 13. Thus, See, Curie, and Nessett do not disclose each and every element of claims 14-15 and 17. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 13-15 and 17 be withdrawn.

D. Claims 19-21 and 23

Claims 19-21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over See in view of Azarmi, Nessett, and Curie. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As described above, Nessett, Curie, and See do not disclose each and every element of independent claim 13. The Examiner does not assert that Azarmi discloses any of the elements of claim 13, but instead relies on Azarmi for role abstractions. As described above in reference to claim 27, Azarmi does not describe role abstractions.

Thus, Azarmi, Nessett, Curie, and See do not describe each and every element of independent claim 13. Claims 19-21 and 23 depend from claim 13 and, as such, include each and every element of claim 13. Thus, Azarmi, Nessett, Curie, and See do not disclose each and every element of claims 19-21 and 23. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claims 19-21 and 23 be withdrawn.

E. Claims 33-35, 37 and 40

Claims 33-35, 37 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over See in view of Azarmi, Nessett, and Curie. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As described above in relation to claim 13, See, Nessett and Curie do not disclose *a rule editing module to create one or more packet rules for analyzing packets received at one or more devices of the communications network, each rule including a condition and action to be*

taken if a packet received at a device satisfies the condition, wherein the one or more packet rules are defined to examine any portion of a packet, as present in independent claim 33. The Examiner does not assert that Azarmi discloses the feature, but rather relies on Azarmi for role abstractions. As described above in reference to claim 27, Azarmi does not disclose role abstractions.

Thus, Azarmi does not disclose role abstractions, and the Examiner recognizes that See, Curie, and Nessett do not disclose role abstractions (Office Action at pages 17-18). Thus, See, Curie, Nessett, and Azarmi fail to disclose *a role editing module to create, in response to a user, one or more role abstractions associated with an authenticated user, each role abstraction representing a role of an authenticated user with respect to the communications network for controlling usage of network resources on the communications network by the authenticated user, and each role abstraction including a set of one or more packet rules; and storage means for storing one or more created role abstractions or one or more created packet rules*, as present in independent claim 33.

Thus, Curie, See, Nessett and Azarmi do not disclose each and every element of independent claim 33. Claims 34-35 and 37 depend from claim 33 and, as such, include each and every element of claim 33. Thus, Curie, See, Nessett, and Azarmi do not disclose each and every element of claims 34-35 and 37. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 33-35 and 37 be withdrawn.

Claim 40 is a medium claim corresponding to claim 27. Based on the arguments made above in reference to claim 27, See, Curie and Azarmi do not disclose each and every element of claim 40. Moreover, based on the arguments made above in reference to claim 33 (itself a system claim corresponding to claim 27), the addition of Nessett does not cure this defect. Thus, Curie, See, Azarmi, and Nessett do not disclose each and every element of claim 40. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 40 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner feels that there are still outstanding issues, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' attorney for a teleconference.

Dated: February 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /David R. Burns/
David R. Burns
Registration No.: 46,590
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant